



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,592	07/05/2006	Hiromu Ueshima	04995/281001	4280
22511	7590	08/17/2009		
OSHA LIANG I.L.P. TWO HOUSTON CENTER 909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500 HOUSTON, TX 77010			EXAMINER HICKS, CHARLES V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/17/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/562,592

Applicant(s)

UESHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

CHARLES HICKS

Art Unit

2629

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-850)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/28/2005

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-32 are cancelled. New claims 33-62 have been added.

Specification

Figure 65 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Specification page 8 line 12, the word "fix" not grammatically correct. Examiner suggests "fixed".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 33, 36, 38-46, 51-56, 58-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Manwaring (US 2002/0098897).

In reference to claim 33, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying on a display device an image on which a motion of an operation article which is held and given the motion by an operator is reflected (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41; a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),

said information processing apparatus comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article (Manwaring, Fig. 3; pg. 2, par. 22),

which has a reflecting surface (Manwaring, Fig. 5; pg. 2, par. 24),

a state information computing unit operable to compute state information of the reflecting surface on the basis of an image obtained by said imaging unit (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 98),

generate a first trigger on the basis of the state information (Manwaring, pg. 5, par. 70);

and an image display processing unit operable to display on the display device a first object representing a movement locus of the operation article in response to the first trigger (Manwaring, Fig. 1, 22).

Claim 36 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 33 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein said state information computing unit computes positional information as the state information of the reflecting surface after speed information as the state information of the reflecting surface exceeds a predetermined first threshold value (Manwaring, pg. 3, par. 46),

until the speed information becomes less than a predetermined second threshold value (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 97),

or computes the positional information of the reflecting surface after the speed information of the reflecting surface exceeds the predetermined first threshold value but before the reflecting surface deviates beyond a photographing range of said imaging unit (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 97),

said state information computing unit determines, when the positional information of the reflecting surface is obtained for three or more times, appearance of the first object representing the movement locus of the operation article on the basis of the first positional information of the reflecting surface and the last positional information of the reflecting surface, and the state information computing unit generates, when the positional information of the reflecting surface is obtained for three or more times, the first trigger on the basis of the state information (Manwaring, Fig. 17-19; pg. 3, par. 45-47).

Claim 38 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 33 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches further comprising a correction information

acquisition unit operable to acquire correction information for correcting positional information as the state information of the reflecting surface, and said state information computing unit computes correctional positional information by using the correction information (Manwaring, pg. 6, par. 90).

Claim 39 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 33 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein the first object includes a plurality of objects (Manwaring, Fig. 22).

Claim 40 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 33 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein said image display processing unit displays the first object representing the movement locus of the operation article on the display device after a lapse of a predetermined time from a generation of the first trigger (Manwaring, pg. 5, par. 73).

In reference to claim 41, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying an image on a display device on the basis of a result of detecting an operation article which is grasped and given a motion by an operator (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41; a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),

said information processing apparatus comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article which has a plurality of reflecting surfaces (Manwaring, pg. 6, par. 90; pg. 2, par. 24);

a state information computing unit operable to compute state information of the reflecting surface on the basis of an image obtained by said imaging unit and determine which of the plurality of reflecting surfaces is photographed on the basis of the state information (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 98),

and an image display processing unit operable to display a different image on the display device depending on the determined reflecting surface (Manwaring, Fig. 1, 22).

Claim 42 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 41 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein the state information includes any one of area information, profile information, and ratio information indicative of a profile, or a combination thereof about the reflecting surface (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 6-7, par. 97).

In reference to claim 43, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying an image on a display device on the basis of a result of detecting an operation article which is grasped and given a motion by an operator (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41, a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),

said information processing apparatus comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article which has a plurality of reflecting surfaces (Manwaring, pg. 6, par. 90; pg. 2, par. 24);

a state information computing unit operable to compute state information of each of the reflecting surfaces on the basis of an image by said imaging unit (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 98);

and an image display processing unit operable to display an image on the display device in accordance with the state information of the plurality of reflecting surfaces (Manwaring, Fig. 1, 22).

In reference to claim 44, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying on a display device an image on which a motion of an operation article which is held and given the motion by an operator is reflected (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41, a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),

said information processing apparatus comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article which has a reflecting surface on the basis of an image obtained by said imaging unit and generate a trigger when the area information exceeds a predetermined threshold value (Manwaring, pg. 6-7, par. 97),

and an image display processing unit operable to display a predetermined object on the display device in response to the trigger (Manwaring, Fig. 1, 22).

Claim 45 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 44 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein said image display processing unit moves the predetermined object in response to positional information of the reflecting surface (Manwaring, Fig. 24),

and a color of the predetermined object is transparent to translucent (Manwaring, Fig. 24).

In reference to claim 46, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying on a display device an image on which a motion of an operation article which is held and given the motion by an operator is reflected (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41, a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),

said information processing apparatus comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article which has a reflecting surface (Manwaring, pg. 6, par. 90; pg. 2, par. 24),

a state information computing unit operable to compute state information of the reflecting surface on the basis of an image obtained by said imaging unit (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 98),

and generate a trigger on the basis of the state information (Manwaring, pg. 5, par. 70),

and an image display processing unit operable to display a character string on the display device, and wherein said image display processing unit displays a character string differing from the character string on the display device in response to the trigger (Manwaring, Fig. 12).

In reference to claim 51, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying on a display device an image on which a motion of an

operation article which is held and given the motion by an operator is reflected (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41, a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),

said information processing apparatus comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article which has a reflecting surface (Manwaring, pg. 6, par. 90; pg. 2, par. 24),

a state information computing unit operable to compute station information of the reflecting surface on the basis of an image obtained by said imaging unit (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 98),

and a process fixing unit operable to fix execution of a predetermined process on the basis of the state information of the reflecting surface (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 5, par. 73).

In reference to claim 52, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying on a display device an image on which a motion of an operation article which is held and given the motion by an operator is reflected (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41, a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),

said information processing apparatus comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article which has a reflecting surface (Manwaring, pg. 6, par. 90; pg. 2, par. 24),

a state information computing unit operable to compute state information of the reflecting surface on the basis of an image obtained by said imaging unit (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 98),

and an image display processing unit operable to display a predetermined object on the display device when the state information that is obtained successively meets a predetermined condition (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 5, par. 73).

In reference to claim 53, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying an image on a display device on the basis of a result of detecting an operation article which is grasped and given a motion by an operator (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41, a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),

said information processing apparatus comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article which has a reflecting surface (Manwaring, pg. 6, par. 90; pg. 2, par. 24),

a state information computing unit operable to compute state information of the reflecting surface on the basis of an image obtained by said imaging unit (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 98),

and an image display processing unit operable to display on the display device a guide which instructs an operation direction and operation timing of the operation article and display an image on the display device in accordance with the state information (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 5, par. 73).

Claim 54 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 33 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein the state information includes one or a combination of two or more being selected from speed information, moving direction

information, moving distance information, velocity vector information, acceleration information, movement locus information, area information, and positional information (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13, pg. 5, par. 73).

Claim 55 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 43 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein the state information includes one or a combination of two or more being selected from speed information, moving direction information, moving distance information, velocity vector information, acceleration information, movement locus information, area information, number information, and positional information (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 5, par. 73).

Claim 56 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 46 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein the state information includes one or a combination of two or more being selected from speed information, moving direction information, moving distance information, velocity vector information, acceleration information, movement locus information, area information, and positional information (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 5, par. 73).

Claim 58 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 51 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein the state information includes one or a combination of two or more being selected from speed information, moving direction information, moving distance information, velocity vector information, acceleration

information, movement locus information, area information, and positional information (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 5, par. 73).

Claim 59 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 52 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein the state information includes one or a combination of two or more being selected from speed information, moving direction information, moving distance information, velocity vector information, acceleration information, movement locus information, area information, and positional information (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 5, par. 73).

Claim 60 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 53 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein the state information includes one or a combination of two or more being selected from speed information, moving direction information, moving distance information, velocity vector information, acceleration information, movement locus information, area information, and positional information (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 5, par. 73).

Claim 61 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 41 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein said operation article is provided with a plurality of reflecting surfaces (Manwaring, pg. 1, par. 9).

Claim 62 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 43 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein said operation article is provided with a plurality of reflecting surfaces (Manwaring, pg. 1, par. 9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 47 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manwaring (US 2002/0098897) in view of Pryor (US 7,098,891).

In reference to claim 47, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying on a display device an image on which a motion of an operation article which is held and given the motion by an operator is reflected (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41, a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),

said information processing comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article which has a reflecting surface (Manwaring, pg. 6, par. 90; pg. 2, par. 24),

a state information computing unit operable to compute state information of the reflecting surface on the basis of an image obtained by said imaging unit (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 98),

and generate a trigger on the basis of the state information (Manwaring, pg. 5, par. 70).

Manwaring however fails teach an image display processing unit updates a background image in response to a trigger.

Pryor discloses an information processing apparatus, analogous in art with that of Manwaring, such that an image display processing unit updates a background image in response to a trigger (Pryor, col. 25, ll. 31-37).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the information processing unit of Manwaring, such that an image display processing unit updates a background image in response to a trigger, as taught by Pryor.

As one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate, the suggestion/motivation would have been to display more realistic motion in response to user actions.

Claim 57 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 47 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein the state information includes one or a combination of two- or more being selected from speed information, moving direction information, moving distance information, velocity vector information, acceleration information, movement locus information, area information, and positional information (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 5, par. 73).

6. Claims 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manwaring (US 2002/0098897) in view of Numazaki et al. (US 6,144,366).

In reference to claim 48, Manwaring teaches an information processing apparatus for displaying on a display device an image on which a motion of an operation article which is held and given the motion by an operator is reflected (Manwaring, Fig. 14; pg. 3, par. 41, a golf club and golf ball put in motion by the user),
said information processing apparatus comprising: an imaging unit operable to photograph the operation article which has a reflecting surface (Manwaring, pg. 6, par. 90, pg. 2, par. 24),

a positional information computing unit operable to compute positional information of the reflecting surface on the basis of an image obtained by said imaging unit (Manwaring, pg. 7, par. 98).

Manwaring however fails to teach an image display processing unit operable to display a cursor on the display device and moves the cursor in accordance with the positional information of the reflecting surface.

Numazaki discloses an apparatus for generating information from an input using reflected light image of a target object, analogous in art with that of Manwaring, wherein an image display processing unit is operable to display a cursor on the display device and moves the cursor in accordance with the positional information of the reflecting surface (Numazaki, col. 26, ll. 8-14).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the information processing device of Manwaring such that an image display processing unit is operable to display a cursor on the display device and moves the cursor in accordance with the positional information of the reflecting surface, as taught by Numazaki.

As one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate, the suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a user with a cursor operable in three-dimensional space (Numazaki, col. 1, ll. 51-56).

Claim 49 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 48 as discussed above and further, Manwaring modified by Numazaki teaches wherein, when the cursor

is displayed so as to be overlapped on a predetermined object, said image display processing unit displays an image associated with the predetermined object on the display device (Numazaki, Fig. 21-22; col. 27, ll. 19-29).

Claim 50 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 48 as discussed above and further, Manwaring modified by Numazaki teaches wherein said image display processing unit display a character selected by the cursor on the display device (Numazaki, Fig. 21-22, col. 28, ll. 33-41).

7. Claims 34, 35, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manwaring (US 2002/0098897) in view of Purdy (US 6,191,799).

Claim 34 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 33 as discussed above and further, Manwaring however fails to teach wherein the first object representing the movement locus comprises a beltlike object, said image display processing unit represents the movement locus of the operation article by displaying the beltlike object on the display so that a width of the beltlike object varies for each prescribed unit which includes at least one frame, and the width of the beltlike object increases as the frame is updated, and thereafter decreases as the frame is updated.

Purdy discloses a method for altering the appearance of an animated object, analogous in art with that of Manwaring, such that the first object representing the movement locus comprises a beltlike object (Purdy, Fig. 3B; col. 4, ll. 56-col. 5, ll. 15),

said image display processing unit represents the movement locus of the operation article by displaying the beltlike object on the display device so that a width of the beltlike object varies for each prescribed unit which includes at least one frame, and the width of the beltlike object increases as the frame is updated, and thereafter decreases as the frame is updated (Purdy, Fig. 3B; col. 4, ll. 56-col. 5, ll. 15).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Manwaring such that the first object representing the movement locus comprises a beltlike object, said image display processing unit represents the movement locus of the operation article by displaying the beltlike object on the display device so that a width of the beltlike object varies for each prescribed unit which includes at least one frame, and the width of the beltlike object increases as the frame is updated, and thereafter decreases as the frame is updated, as taught by Purdy.

As one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate, the suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to take advantage of the dynamic alteration in appearance of animated objects to immediately convey to a user a change in data represented by the object (Purdy, col. 4, ll. 56-col. 5, ll. 15).

Claim 35 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 34 as discussed above and further, Manwaring teaches wherein said image display processing unit displays a second object on the display device (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13),

said state information computing unit generates a second trigger when positional relation between the second object and the first object representing the movement locus of the operation article meets a predetermined condition (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 6-7, par. 96-97),

and said image display processing unit displays a predetermined effect on the display device in response to the second trigger (Manwaring, Fig. 12-13; pg. 6-7, par. 96-97).

Claim 37 is rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 33 as discussed above and further, Manwaring however fails to teach wherein the first object representing the movement locus comprises a beltlike object, said image display processing unit represents the movement locus of the operation article by displaying the beltlike object on the display device so that a width and a length of the beltlike object vary for each prescribed unit which included at least one frame, and the beltlike object increases in length as the frame is updated, and when the length becomes a predetermined length, the width of the beltlike object decreases as the frame is updated.

Purdy discloses a method for altering the appearance of an animated object, analogous in art with that of Manwaring, such that the first object representing the movement locus comprises a beltlike object (Purdy, Fig. 3B; col. 4, ll. 56-col. 5, ll. 15),

said image display processing unit represents the movement locus of the operation article by displaying the beltlike object on the display device so that a width

and length of the beltlike object vary for each prescribed unit which includes at least one frame, and the beltlike object increases in length as the frame is updated, and when the length becomes a predetermined length, the width of the beltlike object decreases as the frame is updated (Purdy, col. 4, ll. 56-col. 5, ll. 15; col. 11, ll. 46-65).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Manwaring such that the first object representing the movement locus comprises a beltlike object, said image display processing unit represents the movement locus of the operation article by displaying the beltlike object on the display device so that a width and a length of the beltlike object vary for each prescribed unit which includes at least one frame, and the beltlike object increases in length as the frame is updated, and when the length becomes a predetermined length, the width of the beltlike object decreases as the frame is updated, as taught by Purdy.

As one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate, the suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to take advantage of the dynamic alteration in appearance of animated objects to immediately convey to a user a change in data represented by the object (Purdy, col. 4, ll. 56-col. 5, ll. 15).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHARLES HICKS whose telephone number is

(571)270-7535. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz, can be reached on 571-272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CH

/Alexander Eisen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629